

QUALITY REPORT

13.75 MW Wind Power Project In Davangere, Karnataka, India

VCS-927 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-58524D0F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.3

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind project under AMS-I.D with a VVB involved and a recent monitoring period, but several internal inconsistencies across documents reduce confidence in key claims. The project shows strong procedural signals on safeguards and stakeholder processes in the latest monitoring record, yet leakage treatment and baseline reassessment timing are weakly evidenced.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-927
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 18.01
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	18,520 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	30 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Major discrepancy in reported emission reductions (18,520 vs 62,808) across validation/monitoring records, creating over-crediting and data reliability risk.
- Leakage is not consistently treated: one monitoring record deems it negligible while a later one does not address leakage at all.
- Large set of corrective actions (CARs) indicates repeated documentation and MRV quality issues (baseline calculation for the monitoring period, meter calibration details, and consistency with AMS-I.D v18).
- Crediting period dates conflict across monitoring reports (2009–2019 vs 2019–2029), raising concerns about vintage/eligibility clarity.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is described as an investment test and is stated as confirmed by the VVB in the 2022 monitoring record.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record; leakage is inconsistently handled across monitoring documents.

The monitoring record (2022-11-04) indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and states it was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not found in the extracted record, weakening baseline robustness. Leakage is a key weakness: the 2022 monitoring record does not address leakage, while an older monitoring record (2011-07-28) reportedly treated leakage as negligible, creating uncertainty about consistent application. No reversal buffer is stated (not applicable/unclear for an avoidance wind project), and no reversal events are reported in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The latest monitoring record provides a defined monitoring period (2021-07-01 to 2022-03-31) and shows claimed and verified ERs matching at 18,520.
- Multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ER totals, crediting period, safeguards statements) and numerous CARs reduce MRV transparency and traceability.

The project provides a clear monitoring period (2021-07-01—2022-03-31) and the latest monitoring record (2022-11-04) shows claimed and verified ERs both at 18,520, which is a positive MRV signal. Transparency is reduced by extensive corrective actions listed in the monitoring/validation materials, including requests to align monitoring parameters and frequencies with AMS-I.D v18, provide meter calibration details, and provide baseline emissions calculations for the monitoring period. Several fields also conflict across documents (ER totals, safeguards statements, crediting period), which undermines confidence in the public record's internal consistency.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream claim risks.
- Contradictory ER figures (18,520 vs 62,808) and unclear leakage treatment increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain high-profile aviation claims. The largest claim-safety concern is potential over-crediting and confusion over what was actually validated/verified, because ER totals differ sharply across documents (18,520 versus 62,808). Leakage treatment is also inconsistent (negligible vs not addressed), which increases the risk that buyers could overstate climate impact if relying on incomplete assumptions. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving an evidence gap for high-integrity labeling.

Documentation — 6.3 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (23 documents) with high extraction confidence and named VVB (VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.).

- The monitoring/validation package contains extensive CARs indicating gaps and inconsistencies in core sections (baseline, monitoring parameters, calibration, stakeholder consultation write-up).

Documentation coverage is moderate-to-good in breadth (23 documents referenced; evidence includes PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high, which supports usability. However, the large number of CARs indicates that key elements required for a robust audit trail were initially missing or inconsistent (baseline discussion, additionality evidence, monitoring parameter alignment, calibration details, and stakeholder consultation formatting). The presence of repeated CAR numbering and overlapping CAR lists also suggests compilation/record-keeping issues that reduce confidence in document control and versioning.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test stated; VVB confirmation inconsistent across documents
● Permanence	Avoidance wind project; no reversal events indicated in extracted record
● Leakage	Leakage not consistently addressed across monitoring records
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC and grievance reported in 2022 but contradicted by older monitoring record
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish a clear reconciliation note (or updated verification/issuance statement) explaining why ER totals differ (18,520 vs 62,808) and which figure applies to which period/vintage.
- Provide a consistent leakage assessment aligned to AMS-I.D v18 (even if zero), with explicit justification and any applicable deduction stated in the monitoring report.
- Resolve crediting period/version-control inconsistencies by issuing an updated PDD/monitoring package with unambiguous start/end dates and document version history.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-58524D0F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy